

REMARKS

This is a complete response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed July 27, 2005. Claim 1 has been amended herein to include claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled and claim 3 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 3-14 remain pending in the present application.

Applicant's amendments put the application in condition for allowance and therefore should be entered. The Applicant traverses all of the rejections of the Office Action. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the above-identified patent application and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Response to claim rejections based on obviousness

In the Office Action, claim 1 has been preliminarily rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Specifically, claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,370 to Glowny et al. (hereinafter, "Glowny") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,877 to Edwards (hereinafter, "Edwards").

A. Claim 1

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the allowable elements of dependent claim 2. Section 4 of the Office Action mailed July 27, 2005 acknowledges that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Applicant has amended base claim 1 to include all of the limitation allowed dependent claim 2. In addition, neither Glowny nor Edwards disclose, teach, or suggest propagating exclusion records between a plurality of distributed call centers as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Therefore the rejection of claim 1 withdrawn and claim 1 allowed.

B. Claims 3-13

The Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 3-13 depend on independent claim 1, claims 3-13 contain all limitations of independent claim 1. Since independent claim 1 should be allowed, as argued herein, pending dependent claims 3-13 should be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1608 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In re: Saima Khan
Filed: September 17, 1999
Serial No.: 09/398,222
Page 10

II. Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot and/or accommodated, and that presently pending claims 1 and 3-14 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and the presently pending claims are hereby courteously requested. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

In re: Saima Khan
Filed: September 17, 1999
Serial No.: 09/398,222
Page 11

Respectfully submitted,

Saima Khan

By Andrew R. Martin
Andrew R. Martin, Esq.
Registration No. 45,413
Attorney for Applicant

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 9-27-05